
Dialogue with LaRouche

Q: On removing Obama, who would you replace him with?

LaRouche: That's easy: Almost anybody! [laughter] That's first.

Seriously, we have plenty of candidates who are qualified, as he is not. He absolutely is not qualified. He's a menace to civilization.

Q: Well, I was told he was more "selected" than "elected."

LaRouche: He was not properly elected, but that doesn't mean anything. Because if we elect a guy who's a bum, he's still a bum and we throw him out.

Q: But those that selected him, would not allow him to be put out of office. And if such a situation would arise, I'm quite sure they would have someone to step in to fulfill whatever their agenda might be.

LaRouche: Well, the point is, throw him out! Throw him out; it's very easy to get a replacement. It can be done very easily.

Q: Okay. Thank you.

Courage: Now or Never

Q: I just moved here to work on Diane's campaign. Because she's going to win! She's going to win and we're all going to be better for it.

But the real challenge that keeps coming up in the field, and quite honestly with many people in this room—many of the lovely people in this room—the question of the idea that mankind, that it's not that things are getting worse at a faster rate, but that mankind is entering a situation where the world as we know it, is going to be dramatically shifted, dramatically changed. So talking about Biden versus Obama, or what do you think about Ron Paul, or fractal geometry, or whatever the hell people want to talk about—I guess I have a question, because, you brought up the two points being World War III and sense-perception not being truthful.

You've also been talking about metaphor, how can we really—because it seems like this is what the organizing is really about, is to give people a sense that there's a whole new world that they're going to be in, and we're going to lead it. And you can't see it. I was blown away! Because you can tell people, "World War III" and they kind of get it because they have the sense that they're going to be blown up or something, or it's going to be bad, and our generation is so messed up that

some people are looking forward to it. But the thing that blew me away, is that a lot of people, in this room, and that you talk to in the field, they're more scared that we *might not* get World War III, that we might get Obama out, we might get Glass-Steagall, and then you'd have a revolution!

And so, I was wondering if you have anything to say to that. Because that seems to be the big block, that you have with people. That's why it seems like they want to talk about these other things....

LaRouche: No, well, actually, the problem is, they're cowardly. And in many cases they're induced to be cowardly, because they don't see the organizable forces being pulled together which are needed to do what is absolutely necessary. And you find most politicians are wimps, when it comes to facing reality; and most citizens, because they see the politicians are wimps, they decide to become wimps, too. They may become very angry, but angry to no purpose. They become enraged at what's being done to them, and may have strange kinds of reactions to the fact that they are enraged by what's been done to them, but they have no constructive sense of what the action is that they must take.

And the problem is, we don't have leaders, who are leaders! Most of the members of Congress, as far as their behavior is concerned, in the Congress, are not behaving as leaders. They've lost that! I know many of them, and they're sitting back there *doing nothing* for the cause, because they don't think it's "their time" to do that! And the point is the time is *now*, in which either we do this, or we're not going to have a civilization!

So the chance for winning, the chance for the survival of civilization, now depends upon a lot of people who think they are not ready to act, and because without that action by them, there's not going to be a solution. And their excuse is, "It wasn't time for me to act. It was not time for me to act."

And therefore, the death of humanity will be expressed by those who say, "It was not time to act."

Now, the alternative is, you've got to know what the action is, and how the time for action is determined. But if we do not throw this President out of office, in the near future, you're not going to have a United States, so there's no discussion to have, unless that decision is made. Once you decide to throw him out of office, then you have a game to play. If you don't throw him out of office, kiss the United States goodbye while you can, because you won't have one if he remains in office, and



www.murray.senate.gov

U.S. Senators were not always the gutless wonders they are today. Here, a number of Democratic Senators rally around a statue of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in February of 2005, when they were fighting to save Social Security from George W. Bush's assault.

that's a fact!

All the arguments to the contrary are absolute nonsense. There is no fact out there, which justifies *not* throwing him out of office *now!* And you won't have a United States and you won't have a nation, unless you do.

And that's the question: Who's got the guts to do what is necessary? We simply have to throw this guy out of office. If we do, we can survive. That doesn't mean we're guaranteed we're going to survive, but we have a chance. If you keep this guy in office, for any extended period now, you're not going to have a United States to talk about. There's not going to be a Presidency to talk about!

How To Get Politicians To Act

Q: I've been following you for decades, since '75, actually, back when I was at [State University of New York at] Stony Brook. A lot of your information has panned out, and I have seen that a lot of the fusion information, as well as the space technology information, has gone from being public information to classified information, and now they're pushing that into privatized corporate structures, that only serve the British Empire and other structures like that, other empires. How do we make the transition from this current system of Presidency in the United States, and make our Constitution

basically global? And do that successfully. Right off the bat, when you get rid of Obama, you're going to alienate at least half of this country—

LaRouche: No. Not at all.

Q: The thing is, a lot of the politicians—like Nancy Pelosi just made an announcement a few weeks ago. They're allowing these politicians to get rich from insider-trading information. So you're basically saying, "We're going to cut off your gravy train, so we can make a change that's going to help the entire world. There's no guarantee this is going to work, but I know if you want to survive, you're not going to have that."

So how do we change these politicians' minds, when they think they're doing this for their own personal survival?

LaRouche: They're not really. Most of these politicians are not really that kind of person these days. What you have is a depressed political class, among the members of Congress. They are giving in, they are going along to get along. They don't have the guts to do anything, and most of the things they do wrong, are simply a result of the lack of guts to do right.

I've known many of these politicians, previously. In the nature of my work, I know the international situation intimately, including high levels of governments. I know generally the high levels of our own government in the United States; we have personal contact with them, and in various ways. I know them.

Throw the Bum Out!

The majority of the American people want no part of this President. *They want him out, period!* And they will not accept anything, until you tell them, you're throwing him out. They have become demoralized, because they fear that this President is going to remain President, and they say they're enraged; they point to the rage, that you can expect violence, which comes when hopeless rage provokes violence.

Throw the Bum Out!

And there's no way—and this is not a race question, because Obama's the enemy of Africa! The British Empire is the enemy of Africa; Africa's a colony of the British Empire! It's a homicidal reign of the British Empire over Africa! And there are very few people who are intelligent, who believe that Obama is a friend of

the black people: It's a nonsense thing. He's a disease, not a person. He's a mental disease.

He's an exact copy, psychologically, of the Emperor Nero! Go look at the Emperor Nero's record; it's all over the place. Look at it. That's your Obama! And that's what he did, and that's what he will do. That's what he is doing! You are not going to have a United States, unless you throw this bum out, and quick! We can't wait for the next election: We won't have a nation by that time. He's got to be thrown out, now. If he's not thrown out now, forget the United States: It's dead! And most of the people in it. And we'll probably have a thermonuclear war on top of that.

So if you want to prevent those things from happening, if you care about the nation enough to prevent those things from happening, you're going to throw him out. And you will find, you will get the greatest applause you ever imagined, from the majority of the American people, the minute this guy goes out of office. Because then, they will begin to believe that they can do something!

Right now we have a population that's gone through—over the period from Obama's Presidency acquisition, from the Summer of 2009—when they began to hate him, because he's a murderer. He's exactly the murderer I described; they began to hate him. And they got to hate him more.

Then they became, not hateful, but despairing. And that's dangerous: no guts. We've got to give the American people back their guts. Because the politicians don't have the guts, except for a few. It's not that they're bad, they just don't have the guts, and having no guts in a war, is rather bad, a bad thing to have.

And therefore, we who care, must at all risk do what



EIRNS/Will Mederski

An overwhelming majority of the American people hate Obama, and are more than eager to see him leave office. Here, protests against Obamacare in 2009; Occupy Wall Street protests in 2011; and protests in front of the White House against the illegal Libyan War earlier this year.

LPACTV

we must, to save this civilization. And the fact that we will do that, and that more of us will do that, will give courage back to our friends and neighbors.

And after all, this system is based on the idea of trying to have friends and neighbors, not all these quarrels. We're trying to find the common interests of mankind, which we can serve, and we're trying to define the terms of cooperation which are the actual urgent priorities for mankind now, to agree on those priorities, and to take on the other issues as well. And we'll find that if we find ourselves cooperating on common issues, we'll

find, we'll come to agreements. Because if we have very much that we prize in our neighbor, in our agreement with our neighbor, we find it easy to agree with him on other things, or to find a way of working it out.

The fact that we're now in a situation where people are *desperate*, because they have no confidence that anything good is going to happen, they're essentially enraged. And those who are not enraged actively, are despondent. They're terrorized; they're saying, "Nothing is going to work." We have to restore *confidence* in the people in themselves. And confidence of the people in themselves, is giving them back their authority. And those of us who are leaders, and who have proven that we can take the heat, of doing what I do, are able to lead. And there are a lot of people out there, who will be easily able to lead, if we make it possible for them to have confidence that they can do it.

I've got it all throughout the United States: People who were, you know, angry a few years ago, are now despairing. They're sitting there just saying, "*There's nothing we can do!* There's no hope for us! There's nothing that's going to happen, that's going to do us any good!" And they're sitting there, terrorized by that kind of situation, and they've lost their confidence.

Those of us who have the courage to stand up and have the capability to stand up, and to present the alternative, have as the chief job, to bring the confidence of our people back, the confidence in themselves, the confidence that what they're doing *means something*. And right now, the problem of most people out there, when they see the conditions of their neighbors; for example, they see their neighbors are being destroyed, and they say, "We're next." And they're sitting there, telling themselves, "There's not a damned thing we can do about it."

My job is to say the things that have to be said, which will give the people back the courage to say, "Yes, I will say that, too." And once that starts, we've won.

Q: I agree totally, the Congress is just terrible. My Congressman had a teleconference call, and I left comments at the end of the call, and this was when the Libya thing began, and I complained about the fact that Obama had not gone to Congress for anything before it all started. And the written response I got, well, I had a nice letter. The opening paragraph was, "Well, gee, isn't it too bad, he didn't go and contact Congress about it?" And then the rest of the letter was just a bunch of

gobbledygook!

What can we do about getting these Congressmen to act?

And the other thing I'd like to say, is: I notice you didn't use a teleprompter.

LaRouche: No, I don't like teleprompters, I don't get along with 'em. They're busybodies, always interrupt you!

No, we are going to do something, and we are doing something! Now, I'm a fighter, but in certain ways. I'm not out there in the street, punching people out or things like that. But on issues of this type, I've spent my life—and I'm now close to 90—I've spent my life on this kind of issue, and I have a certain sense of how you fight such a fight, and I'm doing it. It's what I do, it's what I know how to do. I'm not going to be running for President; I'm a little bit old for that, as you might have perceived. But I'm certainly going to do everything possible to create the next President as a success story. And I think I've got enough influence in various parts of the world, actually, to pull that off. All I need is a little more cooperation.

What Makes Classical Culture Different?

Q: ... We've probably met before, but I considered myself an old friend of Jerry [Pyenson], one of your organizers that passed away not too long ago. . . . It took two to three years for him to actually get me to warm up to your organization, and then when he passed away, it felt like I lost a rock that I was actually standing on.

One of my questions to you is, you know, sometimes it's easy to present these ideas to people who are around my age, but when I try to present it to people who are older, so-called elitists, they just throw it away altogether. One, how do I confront these people? And two, what are the main differences and main characteristics that define Classical culture, that are different from our culture now?

LaRouche: Well, the problem is, Classical culture's correct, and what's happened, the destruction of Classical culture, has been an essential part of the destruction of the mental capabilities of the population. Classical culture has a very specific significance. What happens, when it becomes merely "entertainment," without criteria, then the people lose their mooring.

The key issue here is always, in humanity, is what we call creativity. Now, creativity is not, you know, "variation"; it is not innovation. Creativity respects certain principles of the *mind*, which only really Classical



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

“Classical culture has a very specific, unique role in developing the powers of the human mind,” LaRouche said, in a response to a question on its role. Here, a string quartet plays in celebration of Robert Schumann’s 200th anniversary.

cultures can convey.

What we’ve had, is, people have lost their connection, or never had it, to Classical culture. And therefore, they go out in life, and they find themselves crippled by the lack of Classical culture’s access. In other words, to think, to think creatively, occurs only in Classical culture. Now, there’s authentic Classical culture, and there are authentic Classical cultures, and we can trace them back all the way to the Classical Greek, in particular, which is fairly well known. We have other cases of that, Classical culture, and they come in different sizes, so to speak, and different flavors, but they all have certain characteristics. And it’s a subject in itself, as to what Classical culture is. It’s one of my specialties, but I don’t find everybody’s familiar with that specialty!

But Classical culture has a very specific, unique role in developing the powers of the human mind. And the lack of development of the human mind, in that direction, is actually an impediment to progress. It doesn’t mean you’re bad; it means that you have not acquired this weapon, shall we say, the weapon of progress, the present weapon of mental progress. And we have denied most people in society a familiarity with what this concept is, and therefore, they’re cut off from something they should have the right to know, and the right to experience.

If someone was given, say in music, a real systemic education in what musical composition is, they would

find it not difficult to begin to understand what it’s all about; and they would be able to understand what’s wrong with the alternative. Because, when you discover that you have powers of your own mind, which you discover you were not using, and now you begin to get acquisition to those powers of the mind that you weren’t using, you begin to find that you are much more important than you thought you were! And it’s that role of Classical culture which is, shall we say, the beginning, entry point, of Classical culture: when people realize there’s something *there*, which they can’t get in any other way, and it means something *to them*, that they understand *themselves* better, than they did before, then, they find a source of strength in that.

And the first thing I’m concerned about, is the inner sense of the source of strength inside the person. Classical culture, as any—for instance, scientific education and so forth—these things strengthen the person *inside*, because they have access to *more power* over society, society’s condition, than they do otherwise. In the sense, when they say, “Well, I am somebody! I am something, I mean something. I’m not just a thing. I got something inside me, that you need to know. I got something inside me I need to give you!”

And when you can say that to your audience around you, you feel strong. You feel happy. The world is more yours. You don’t have to excuse yourself for what you are. You don’t have to make apologies for what you are. “I learned something yesterday, buddy! And it’s good!”

And that’s the kind of thing I would like to have conveyed to people who ask this question: exactly that. We have accesses, probably with Classical art, and so forth, and science, we have the means to enable people to make breakthroughs, even on a fairly limited, beginning basis, where they can appreciate what their mind is, what it represents. And once you’re sure that your *mind* means something, then you’re empowered, and you’re not easily crushed. You don’t have to apologize for yourself.

Q: And to that end, I was watching this video that you had, with Jussi Björling’s grandson, your wife, and yourself, “The Classical Revolution.” And I thought it

was interesting, this guy who was your friend, Norbert Brainin, mentioned something, and it was really heartfelt the way he presented it: that he'd been holding something in his heart for a long time, and the only other person who understood it, was you. So could you elaborate on what exactly that was?

LaRouche: Well, he was a real genius, absolutely unique. He was of Jewish origin from Austria, and when the Hitler problem became so active, he was among those who fled and went to England. And when he got to England, he found he was put in prison, or a kind of prison, because he was of German pedigree—even though a Jewish victim of Hitler! And, therefore, he and his friends were stuck into a kind of British prison.

Then there was a slight improvement in his circumstances, and he and the Quartet became one of the greatest musical groups in all modern history, an absolutely remarkable achievement.

And he came to meeting a friend of mine, on the streets of Paris, when something I'd written was there, and he was fascinated by that, and by that, we became close friends, and remained that until his death. He was actually a first-rate genius; his work is remarkable. If you understand the string quartet in particular, he's absolutely remarkable, in what he and the team did, the Amadeus Quartet.

This is part of the beauty of life! He's dead, unfortunately; he was actually younger than I was, but he was one of those geniuses, and a center of radiation of genius, in that and other ways. We had, at that point in our association, until prior to his death, we were associated through this group of people in Europe and elsewhere, with all the greatest musicians, or most of the greatest musicians, then living in Europe and the United States. And believe me, that was a happy experience: When you find yourself with your next-door neighbor, your closest friend, and your contacts, are all people who love what you love, and are part of the same thing that you're part of, then it's a pretty good feeling.

And one of the things that's good about artistic and other work, and scientific work, is a by-product of that; you find something in yourself, which you really respect: You are participating in something which is im-



EIRNS/Philip Ulanowsky

Musical genius Norbert Brainin, who was the first violinist in the Amadeus Quartet, formed a close personal friendship with LaRouche. Here the two are shown together in December of 1987.

portant to you, which defines your life as meaningful. You have all these wonderful musicians, the greatest musical talent that existed in the world in that time. These are all sort of my friends, in this group, along with Norbert and so forth.

Do you want anything better than that in life? And there are things like that, in other forms of life, in science and so forth. These are the things that count, and these are the experiences that are precious for you, when all your friends are dead. Like, I'm getting to this age of nearly 90, and I've got a lot of "all my friends are dead" cases. But I have memories of these people, memories of these old friends, and this is one of the most beautiful experiences of my life. And thus, I wish everyone would have the same experience.

Organizing: Surprise People!

Q: I'm from Brooklyn, and I'm not exactly sure what my question is, as a question, so I'm just going to kind of throw some things out here.

Since I've been involved in the LaRouche organization, I've come to know things I never knew before, and I get very frustrated with trying to go out there and do the type of organizing and talk to people and get them to understand what's going on, and get them to *do* something about it. So, I've been thinking about all types of things to do beyond what I've already done. And I'm not trying toot my own horn, or anything, I'm just trying to get people in this audience to understand that maybe if they're feeling this way, it's because this

is what we have to do.

So, if we're part of this organization, this is what we have to do: We have to get that frustration to build up, to start annoying people enough, and giving out enough materials, and going through enough reflection on what to do. So, I've even thought of writing an op-ed to the *New York Times*, I've thought of handing out material on buses, you know, making charts that show what Glass-Steagall is; going through a lot of the things that we as individuals have to come to, to really fight what's going on, and get Obama thrown out.

So, what are some of the really practical things, that we can do, to make this happen? Because if I have to write the op-ed—I'm working with colleagues within the organization, now, to get something through the UFT [United Federation of Teachers] on Glass-Steagall—we've met with all types of sophistry, every time we introduce this resolution, and yet we keep plugging at it, so now we think, after months of really hard work, we'll finally get this through the UFT.

Then there are other places, and things I've thought of doing, talking to Congresspeople, going to their offices, like we did for Glass-Steagall, and the Homeowners and Bank Protection Act. And now it's at the point where I'm getting to feel that I need to hand out stuff on buses, write to the *New York Times*, write to Congresspeople. Who are these military people that we need to contact, that have been in contact with you? Maybe we need to jump on their case, too.

So, I think the people in the audience are feeling that, and we need to know some really practical ways of getting this to happen.

LaRouche: Well, as you know, the greatest thing to experience, is a surprise. See, you walk in to talk to somebody, and what they're going to do—as you know, from experience—the first thing you're going to run into in most cases, is they're going to prediscuss anything you've got to say. I don't care whether they've seen you for the first time, know who you are, or don't know who you are, or whatever. The tendency, on the one hand, is to try to ingratiate themselves with you. One side. Or to pretend to doubt you, and say, "Where're you getting that from?"

Q: Exactly!

LaRouche: Therefore, the greatest element of art, is the element of surprise. And you know what that is, you know what it is in music, you know what it is in science and so forth. If you want to get a class awakened in a schoolroom, you have to surprise them.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

LPAC organizer Jessica White, a teacher who worked indefatigably and successfully to get the American Federation of Teachers to endorse Glass-Steagall, asked LaRouche a question on what was the next "practical" step to be taken to get Obama out.

Q: That's true.

LaRouche: Because if they can prediscuss you, they're just going to sleep there and watch you. If you surprise them, in a way they can not deny, then they're going to show some respect, and they're going to respond. And they're going to start asking you things, rather than trying to tell you things. And this often comes, in terms of what you're talking about, in getting in front of certain strange audiences. In front of a classroom you may feel perfectly comfortable; you know the territory, you know how the people are, you've got them cased even before you get in there. If you go out in the streets with strangers, you're not so sure that you can pull the element of surprise.

When you get out in the street more, or in these situations more, then you begin to get more self-confidence, and realize that when you're in the classroom, you're self-confident, and when you're out of the classroom, you're not as self-confident. But, you find, "Okay, if I understand that, that's the way this game is being played. I've got to get in there, and not be hesitant, but go in there with certain caution, but a certain cleverness." And you're going to give them a pleasant surprise, that's going to get their attention, and they're going to start thinking. They're not going to react to you; they're going to start thinking about what you're going to say.

But once they're thinking about what you are saying, you've got the situation in hand: It's all yours then. And

however far it can go.

And the whole thing is, how do you define your self-confidence, the proper self-confidence; how do you keep from exaggerating it? In the classroom, you know how to do it. You know exactly what the rules are, implicitly. And in a different environment, you may not be so confident—“This is an environment I don’t know as well,” and you may be more hesitant. Well, the best thing to do, is just practice it, and get involved with other people, the intermediate thing, where you can have more discussions with small groups of people, and things like that. And get their reactions to you, in a friendly response area.

Q: And that’s what we should do?

LaRouche: Yes. And so, we should make sure we’re forming small groupings, where we work together, in a small group, and we discuss what’s going on out there, not the classroom area as such, necessarily, but some other area. And you broaden your ability, your confidence in dealing with a larger thing. And so, the more you do that way, the more strength and confidence you have in doing it. I think the prognosis for you is very good!

Q: Thank you!

A Question of Trust

Q: Anyway, my question is—speaking of surprises, I was very surprised, when the *New York Times*, about a week ago, came out with this bombshell exposé of the Department of Justice laundering hundreds of millions, maybe billions of dollars in drug money. What significance do you think this has in terms of removing Obama from office? Does this represent a signal on the part of a faction of the establishment, that they’re getting ready to pull the plug on Obama? And how important do you think this Fast & Furious scandal is, in terms of creating a kind of Watergate-like environment, that would enable us to remove Obama?

LaRouche: Well, Fast & Furious is obviously going to be a factor which is *used* politically in the present situation. This is not a simple kind of situation, but there are many conflicting kinds of interests involved, particularly when something is not going too well. There’s a tendency of someone to start lynching their neighbor: “We’ve got some competition here; I’ve got to lynch this guy, who I was associated with,” that sort of thing.



DoD/Helene C. Stikkel

The U.S. military command has been the most significant force in the U.S., other than LaRouche and his movement, to intervene to stop Obama from going to war. Here, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey.

So you’re in a chaotic situation, in which there’s nothing positive coming out of this President. Nothing positive, for anybody who’s serious. Just as a citizen, of any kind of interest. There’s nothing for them in this President. He represents no good. He is a no-good President, and worse.

So therefore you have a tendency for people to jump ship. For example, you will tend to have people going from Republican to Democrat and Democrat to Republican, in various ways, similar things like that. There is very little inherent stability in the affinity tendencies within society today. Very few people trust anybody else. And the trust among people is much lowered than what it had been even when Obama came into office.

Think back what it was like, when Obama was first in office. He was a bum! And I knew it. But in the first period of his incumbency, I was in a situation where I was working with people who were then working with Obama. I knew what he was, I knew he had been incarnated as President, in some fashion or other.

But then, I began to see, after a couple of bills that were put through [Treasury Secretary Tim] Geithner, I saw what was really going on! And therefore, in the following year, in the following Spring, I had a complete diagnosis, and a fully accurate diagnosis of exactly what this guy was, exactly what he was going to do. He’s a carbon copy, psychologically, of Emperor Nero, and stuck into office, powerful office, he was going to

act like the Emperor Nero, more and more, as the Emperor Nero himself acted more and more, like the Emperor Nero! As he began killing people indiscriminately. Which is what this guy's doing now.

So, those are the kinds of problems we face. We're in a situation, in which the lack of the sign of a quality of leadership emerging, which could be trusted to do something which is needed badly, now; the lack of that confidence is holding the American population at bay. They don't know whom they can trust! And the more the Democrats continue to support Obama, and when they see the mess that the Republican assortment is, right now, the American people tend to lose confidence in their own future. They don't have somebody they think is even a decent guy they could trust as a bad President. You know, people often say, "You know, that President's no damned good, but I've got to support him, he's the President." Right? But that doesn't exist any more!

This guy is pure bum, and there's no sign from the Democratic Party that they're going to do anything about it. And my assessment, in looking at this situation, is—and it's a good assessment, it's a knowledgeable assessment—there are a great number, relatively speaking, of Republicans, whom I would prefer over a large number of Democrats; and somewhat vice versa. So therefore, I realize that what we need to do, this time, and the way we need to think about how we deal with the social situation out there; we have to think on the *merit of the citizen, not the partisanship*.

Yes, partisanship is not indifferent. It's not an indifferent question. *But*, we've come to a time, when there's been so much betrayal of what people thought they trusted, that today you could only bring together an effective force in the Congress, by putting the partisan aspect a little bit to one side. And when it comes to the issue, it should be the issue as such, and the implications of that issue, which we go with.

When we get to that point, if we think we can possibly win, if we think we can possibly get Obama out of office, I think you will see a revolutionary change in the reaction of the population.

For example, if the word came out today, the Democratic Party is dumping Obama because he's a bum, for the obvious reasons of cause, for which he'd be dumped, then you would find a revolution in politics, because the Democratic Party would, by and large, begin to become the Democratic Party again, at least in the rank and file. And at the same time, you would have Republicans, who, having looked at some of the Republican candi-

dates, would say "Awh! Not that for me, this time!" And they would say, "It's much better to be a citizen, in holding office in the United States, than to be a citizen, being held in office by a party."

And that's what we have; you probably heard some of that today. The report that was given today, was the fact that we're functioning as citizens of the nation, first, and when we run in office in a state, for Federal office in a state, we're running as *citizens of the United States*, not members of the state, primarily; but associated with the state, in a secondary role, on the state level. And that's the way it should be.

And I think that that kind of formulation, once the shakeup were to occur, in which Obama had been thrown out, I think you will find a strong *bipartisan* tendency among the incumbents on the Federal level, while they might continue to have a state influence on the state level.

And I think that's where we should be headed right now, because I know, under those circumstances—for example, on the military question, we have a number of people who are tied to the U.S. military, at the highest level, and similar levels. They are actually more competent on some aspects of the military question, and I trust them on that. I trust their instincts; I know them. So therefore, you would have some people, because of their state-level concerns, or other concerns, professional concerns, who might be more suited for the Republican Party at this time. Fine, so what? So therefore, we have a mixture of Republicans and Democrats, and maybe an Independent or two thrown in here or there (not actually thrown in, but that sort of thing).

And under those circumstances, I think if we can get that now, if we can get that understanding in the month of December, I think we've got it made. Because we're going into the early part of the next year, and then things are going to get sort of closed up in preparations for the coming Presidential elections and state elections.

This is the time, this immediate time. And I think it's possible. And I think it's necessary for me, for example, to do everything possible to make it happen. Which is what I'm trying to do.

Why the British Empire Is the Key

Q: I'm from New Jersey, and I was brought up in a Communist country, so I see right away what the occupant of the White House is doing. He's not governing, he's ruling, and he's a communistic dictator. That's what he is!



White House/Pete Souza

The British are the only empire on this planet, and they control U.S. President Barack Obama. To get our nation back, Obama has to be removed.

And I was just wondering: He did so much crime and damage in this country—I came here in 1971, after the Russian invasion, which was in 1968—and when he was campaigning, I knew right away, when he said I’m not going to govern, I’m going to rule, and “hope and change,” “yes, we can”—that’s what Castro did when he was campaigning. But I think the American people, they were sleeping. I mean, they are very naive, and sometimes dumb!

I’m sorry! Because you don’t know what Communism is! It’s misery, tyranny, and slavery. When I came here, I kissed the ground, because I was so happy, I am now in a free country. And when I see this bum, what he’s doing, it breaks my heart—I’m getting so upset! Yes, he should be thrown out, kicked out, from the office, and I don’t know why it wasn’t done. Why? Can anybody explain it to me? The whole country knows. He said, I’m going to be a unifier—no, he became a divider. And he is a racist. And it’s just unbelievable. I mean, he is deliberately sabotaging this country. We can have jobs here.

My question is, because Mr. LaRouche said that the Empire of England, that he is their outcome. No! He is a communist, a communistic dictator. He doesn’t have anything to do with the British Empire. That’s my question.

LaRouche: No, the British Empire *is* the problem, that is the problem. It’s the only empire on this planet. For example, let’s take the case of Africa: The entirety of Africa is a British colony, and it’s a mass murderous

British colony. And similar kinds of things. For example, Saudi Arabia is a tool of the British Empire: 9/11 was organized by the British, with the collaboration of the Saudis in terms of that operation: That’s a fact!

So what you have is, you have evil on this planet, as well as some things that are not evil. And the British Empire, and what it’s done to Africa, is an example of evil.

You have also, in the nature of the old systems of government, you have many cultures which have elements of oppression characteristic of the government. This characteristic of the government comes from the old monarchical system, the oligarchical system, in which—in all oligarchical systems—there’s a tendency of complete repression. Sometimes it’s silent repression, sometimes it’s violent and loud

repression. But people get to know, that if you do certain things in a certain way, you get punished; one way or the other, things happen to you that wouldn’t happen otherwise.

So you have, in most of the systems in Asia, we’ve gone through that. We’ve had cases like that in the South in the United States, in the slavery system, which was introduced here. It was very similar. So we have *repression* as such, in many manifestations, throughout the world.

We in the United States, are relatively free of most of it, of the worst of it. Other countries are more susceptible to it. But the way I approach it, is not to worry about that aspect as such, but to look for the cure. The cure lies in what the potential of the individual mind is, the culture, the development of that human mind. And anything that represses that potential, bothers me. And should bother anyone. In the United States, we have relatively—or have had, relatively, the greatest relative freedom of any part of the world. We’ve achieved it.

But now, in the recent period, since Bill Clinton left office, we’ve had nothing but tyranny, oppressive tyranny. And the British are a tyrannical power. They kill more people, the British kill more people on this planet than anybody else, by all kinds of methods. But the repressive methods in Africa and elsewhere, in other parts of the world, they’re there, they’re reality. I’m very familiar with them. And I know what happens in Europe and other parts of the world, this way.

We Have To Get Our Nation Back!

Q: I'd like to ask you a question in three parts, really quick: First part, if I have your permission, I would like to give my support to Hillary, under the duress that she has to deal with every day with Mr. Barack Obama. And I don't know how close you are to Bill, but if it's possible, you could encourage him to maybe make a public statement about what Obama has done to his wife. And third, I'd like to work with the Philadelphia chapter, to try to put something in writing to the local papers about how he's brutalized her, when she's doing her part to keep our world at peace.

Thank you.

LaRouche: Okay, well, I think the only solution for that thing is to throw him out of office. He's not going to be reformed. He may be imprisoned or something, or put into a mental asylum, but he's not going to be reformed. The prognosis is, he's got an incurable evil inside him, and that's not going to be changed. The point is, when we get that kind of situation, we may elect people to office, we discover they have these characteristics, we should throw them out. We can't say, "They have 'rights'" when they're abusing the rights of others! Are you going to attack the lesser, or the greater evil?

If a person in power is oppressing people, from a position of power, it's *they* who must be removed, not the people punished for objecting to them. And the problem now, is because of what's happened, since the killing of John F. Kennedy, the United States has no longer had the morality it had at the moment that John F. Kennedy was killed; and particularly, when his brother was also killed.

And this was during the period of the Indo-China War, which would *never* have happened, if Kennedy had not been killed. He was supported fully by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in his opposition to the very idea of the Indo-China War. And he was killed *because he opposed the war!* Which the British demanded that it be done to him! That's the truth. His brother was killed for the same reason. Bobby was already about to be nominated as the Democratic candidate for President, at the moment he was murdered.

The murder of the two Kennedys spelled out the cause for all the suffering which has occurred, as a trend since that time. This is not to say that Jack and Bob were great spirits of genius, or something; they were both very intelligent people. But the issue here, they were legitimately—one, the President, one would have been the President, if he'd lived to become President.

The killing of these two changed the character of the United States, to one of degeneracy with Nixon, and *we never really won it back!*

Reagan was Reagan, who was a break in some of the worst elements there, and played some good roles. Bill Clinton was exceptionally good. He had certain shortfalls in terms of what his ability to perform was, but he was a good choice otherwise, and for two terms, that's really remarkable under the circumstances. Once Bill was out of office, no! The Hell came in!

And you look and see, what's the history of this? Well: George H.W. Bush, and George W. Bush were offspring of the Bush who, in New York, put Hitler into power in Germany! He moved the money, together with the British, into Germany, when Hitler was about to be thrown out of politics for legal reasons, and Hitler was put suddenly into a position of power, again, for the purpose of creating the coup which brought Hitler into power. And this was done by Prescott Bush, the father of George H.W. Bush, and the grandfather of George W. Bush!

These people were both tied in, anyway, to the Wall Street crowd which had fully backed Adolf Hitler! And as soon as we had won the war against Hitler in the invasion of Northern Europe, the British went back to supporting the same policies, which the British had used to put Hitler into power in Germany. And that's the nature of things.

And it's when we understand the true history of how the people of the United States became demoralized, with the sense of betrayal, and misleadership, and lack of trust of anything—.

You know, what happened after Bobby was killed, and this process started: We have never been the same, as a nation; we have never been courageous, as a nation, since these things happened, since the assassination of Kennedy. And we all knew it was an assassination, not by some oddball, but a deliberate killing to eliminate a President of the United States, because he was an obstacle to British policy. And his brother, when then, about to become a candidate for the Presidency, a Democratic candidate, was killed, too. And then, Hell broke loose! And it's been getting worse, most of the time, since. And the case of Bill Clinton was sort of a miracle that came in the middle of the sandwich, somewhere along the line.

That's where we are: We now have to get our nation back. And we have to have the guts and the wisdom, to do the things that will bring that back, now!